

RECEIVED

APR 05 2012

OFFICE OF ENERGY AND PLANNING

April 4, 2012

Chairman Morin and Members of CORD NH Office of Energy and Planning 107 Pleasant Street, Johnson Hall Concord, NH 03301

Re: CORD Consideration of Fish and Game's Wild Goose Site Proposal

Dear Ms. Morin,

In our hurry to conclude the public testimony on Monday, I failed to raise one very significant consideration; that being the whole issue of public access vs. conservation. CORD is charged with protecting and maintaining the "natural beauty...." of all the LCIP acquired properties. Fish & Game is charged with providing "public access" to the lakes and Great Ponds of NH for <u>all</u> the public. At the Wild Goose site, those two mandates are in contention. They need not be.

Unfortunately, the Federal Matching Funds program (80%) has led Fish & Game to focus substantial efforts on motorized trailered launch sites, such as the Wild Goose proposal. This favors the small segment of the lake-using public that own large, trailered water-craft.

As proposed, the scheme does not provide access for the public at large and it further limits that access to just a few months of the year.

The proposed two-acre, paved parking lot is limited to cars with boat trailers and to a few car-top boat spaces. There is no parking or space available for swimmers, picnicers, shore fishermen, bird watchers, hikers or any other members of the public who simply want to access the site to connect with the lake and its beauty.

Fish & Game's current proposal does little to increase the NH public's access to this beautiful site or to the myriad of lake activities that this site could provide. As I did point out at the hearing, it is entirely within Fish & Game's discretion and legal mandate as to the type and size and extent of the access they propose for a particular site. Fish & Game's current proposal is simply too big, too limiting and too destructive of the site.

Although counter-intuitive, a much smaller, type III or IV car-top launch, unpaved and kept as natural as possible, could provide much more access for the public as a whole. Access to the small beach & the beach itself could be improved for swimmers and as a car-top boat launch site;

a seasonal fishing pier could be installed; picnic tables and play areas could be located in existing open areas. No clear cutting or major disturbance would be required.

In addition, the site could be kept open year round and provide winter access for ice-fishermen, ski-mobilers, ice-boaters, ice-sailors, skiers and snowshoers. Such a plan would also resolve the various serious safety issues surrounding trailered boat access onto and off the site. Finally it would cost only a fraction of the million-dollar-plus estimated cost of the current proposal.

Neither LSPA nor the town of Newbury oppose public access to this site nor the use of the site as a small boat launch. We do oppose the current Fish & Game plan for all the reasons stated. We strongly urge CORD to reject the current proposal and suggest to Fish & Game that it submit a smaller car top facility that could meet everyone's concerns and maximize usage by the entire public.

I apologize for not raising this issue at the hearing and thank you for considering it as part of your deliberations. Hopefully this letter can be circulated to the panel members prior to Monday.

I would also strongly urge any of the CORD members to actually visit the site if they have not done so.

Sincerely

Thomas H. Richards, Esq.

Cc: Evan Mulholland, Esq., Allen Brooks, Esq., Greg Smith, Esq., Justin Richardson, Esq.